

## Governance Boards

### BACKGROUND

The Board of Regents is the body with primary responsibility for the governance of the UW System. The board consists of 18 members including: (a) 14 citizen members appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate for staggered seven year terms; (b) two student members, one of whom is required to be over 24 years old to represent the interests of nontraditional students, appointed by the Governor for two year terms; (c) two ex-officio members, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the President of the Wisconsin Technical College System Board. Under 2011 Act 89, at least one of the Regent members appointed by the Governor must reside in each of the state's congressional districts. The Governor will begin appointing Regents based on congressional district beginning May 1, 2013 and by 2019, all congressional districts will be represented on the Board of Regents.

By Wisconsin State Statute, the Board of Regents has the following power and responsibility to: (1) enact policies and promulgate rules for governing the system; (2) plan for the future needs of the state for university education; (3) ensure the diversity of quality undergraduate programs while preserving the strength of the state's graduating training and research centers; (4) promote the widest degree of institutional autonomy within the controlling limits of system-wide policies and priorities established by the Board. Chapter 36 also delegates governance authority to the UW System President, chancellors, institutional faculty, academic staff, and students as shared governance.

Last spring, the Governor introduced the 2011-2013 biennial budget bill that would have broken the University of Wisconsin-Madison away from the UW System, establishing it as an independent institution governed by a separate Board of Trustees. This Board of Trustees would have been composed of 21 members: (a) 11 members appointed by the Governor, including at least one member of the Board of Regents, at least one member representing the agricultural interests of this state, and at least seven alumni of UW-Madison; (b) two faculty members selected by the faculty; (c) one UW-Madison employee who is not a faculty member selected by UW-Madison employees who are not faculty; (d) two UW-Madison alumni selected by the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation (WARF) Board; (e) two UW-Madison alumni selected by the Wisconsin Alumni Association Board; (f) two UW-Madison alumni selected by the UW Foundation Board; and (g) one UW-Madison student selected by the UW-Madison students. The UW-Madison chancellor would have served as a nonvoting member. The UW-Madison Board of Trustees would have been granted all the powers required to govern the institution; powers similar to that of the Board of Regents.

The Joint Committee on Finance and Legislature deleted all provisions in the budget relevant to the independence of UW-Madison from the UW System. Instead,

the biennial budget act created this Task Force to consider structure and governance, as well as other issues of flexibility.

The way state statute currently stands the creation of institutional advisory boards is not prohibited. While the Board of Regents first adopted policy regarding advisory councils in 1972, this policy was most recently amended in 1987 to require the research institutions of the UW System to establish a Board of Visitors. There is no prescription as to the membership of these Boards or the frequency of the meetings. All other UW institutions are encouraged, but not mandated, to establish such boards.

UW System President Kevin Reilly created the UW System Ad Hoc Work Group on UW System Structure and Governance in the fall of 2011 to: (1) consider the issue concerning governance included in the Task Force's charge; and (2) identify governance structures from university systems around the country so that there could be a system-wide discussion about the pros and cons in the establishment of local advisory boards for each campus.

The report issued by the group in February (which was distributed to this Task Force on February 7) found that 10 out of 14 UW System institutions currently have some sort of institutional advisory board or group ranging in size from 5 to 30 members. Out of these 14 institutions, more than half of the chancellors responded that they had little or no interest in having such a board at their institutions due to concerns about additional bureaucracy at the campus level, the creation of confusion and conflict, and the weakening of chancellors' power.

## RECOMMENDATION

After extensive background research and debate, students find that institutional advisory boards can play an important role in the governance structure of the UW System, so long as their role remains strictly advisory.

Olivia Wick-Bander  
UW Madison Student  
Board Member, United Council of UW Students

## Tuition

I'm going to discuss tuition, a topic very important to many students. First, I'd like to give a bit of historical context in terms of tuition.

	Madison	Comprehensives
1971	\$451	\$349
1983	\$1,065	\$886
1992	\$2,076	\$1,686
2000	\$3,290	\$2,594
2011	\$8,592	\$5,970

	Madison	Comprehensives	Colleges
Avg. yearly incr. since beginning	7.9%	7.6%	6.4%
Last decade	9.2%	8.3%	6.4%

As a summary, the United Council Board of Directors and students I've spoken to generally agree:

- Legislative input on tuition is appropriate, legislators represent the people of Wisconsin and have a role in ensuring that costs for students and their families remains relatively low
- Regents and Chancellors are managers and the only revenue generating tool they have is tuition, which can bias their thinking on the issue
- System opposes a legislative tuition cap, however it is our thinking that the only reason to oppose tuition caps is because you desire to raise tuition higher than that cap
- We look to other states like California where double digit increases in tuition are the norm
- Sticker shock is real and has negative effects on lower income, first generation, and underrepresented students

I'll now focus my remarks on the questions posed to the task force in your materials:

**1) Should the Board of Regents raise tuition to capture the higher willingness and**

**ability to pay of some Wisconsin families and increase revenues? To what extent could tuition be increased?**

At a time when the economy isn't doing well, wages are stagnant, financial aid is staying the same (and thus through inflation decreasing in value), discussing tuition increases of any significant amount is highly inappropriate.

Also, tuition increases often are aimed at recruiting wealthier out of state students which does not accomplish the mission of Wisconsin universities of serving Wisconsin students.

**2) If tuition were to be increased substantially, what measures could be taken to ensure access to UW institutions for all qualified resident applicants regardless of family income?**

In a study from the a 501(c)(3) thinktank, the Economic Opportunity Institute in April 2009, they looked at the effects of a "high tuition high financial aid" model at four research tier 1 universities - the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor, the University of Miami-Ohio, the University of Washington, and the University of Vermont.

While these are all tier 1 research schools, they should be the most resilient to impacts from tuition increases as part of their pursuit of a high tuition high financial aid model.

To quote the study:

"

- Enrollment of low income and underrepresented minority students in part due to 'sticker shock'
- Enrollment of high-performing students declines due to greater competition with private colleges
- Educational quality decreases as schools shift funds in the struggle to maintain access
- Financial aid packages emphasize loans that contribute to high levels of student debt

"

They also found "Every \$1,000 increase in tuition results in a 6% decrease in enrollment."

The University of Michigan-Ann Arbor in a decade of pursuing a high tuition, high financial aid model saw students in the income bracket of \$10,000-\$75,000 dropped 10% with a corresponding increase of the same amount in students with family incomes \$200,000.

To quote the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor Financial Aid Director Pam Fowler: "Our cost scares people away it's hard for prospective students to reconcile that yes, we may be more expensive, but we give more financial aid."

This study is not alone, the large amount of academic work shows that the high tuition, high financial aid model does not accomplish its goals or benefit a university's bottom line.

This should answer question #3:

Should tuition revenues be used to fund need-based financial aid for low income students?

Of course we would encourage philanthropy, but the high tuition high financial aid model cannot be viewed as a solution.

**4) Should the Board of Regents continue to approve differential tuition plans to individual institutions or should the Regents take a systemwide approach and engage in strategic finance?**

We would ask that you respect the original intent of differential tuition, which was at first to provide institutional funding for more expensive departments and units. Then differential tuition was instituted for innovative programs unique to institutions and NOT for backfill or replacing lost state aid. Also, differential tuition is not to create a caste system.

**5) Should Chancellors, rather than the Board of Regents have the authority to establish tuition & fees for the institution?**

First on fees - if you aren't aware, Wisconsin has the absolute proudest tradition of student shared governance in the country, and state statute respects the authority of students to allocate fees outside of tuition and recommend no change.

Second, on tuition. We believe it should be maintained with Board of Regents. However, Chancellors are managers of institutions and unfortunately may sometimes see tuition in a different and unhealthy way as a means of accomplishing their bottom lines. Chancellors are focused on their institution, and rightfully so, however the Regents provide a statewide and holistic view that looks out generally for the people of the state. The Regents provide a proper and necessary check and balance on tuition and the Chancellors.

**6) What role should the legislature have in establish tuition rates?**

The legislature's role is to protect the public interest and protect Wisconsin families and excessive cost increases. We believe in a hard tuition cap - of course we can argue about the appropriate level. Ultimately, we find that any level is arbitrary due to the difficulty

of finding an accurate index of higher education inflation. We support the 5.5% increase restriction currently in place. As I mentioned earlier, I know UW System opposes a tuition cap, however there are only two reasons to oppose a tuition cap - 1) if you don't like outside control on your actions on principle, but the real reason is 2) that you want to raise tuition higher than the cap.

I will leave you with this - since 1970 there has been only one year without a tuition increase - 2000. Also, we need only look back to 2003 & 2004 for double digit tuition increases at 18.2% and 15.4%, which is why we support a legislative role in tuition ceilings.

Thank you.

Dylan Jambrek  
UW Eau Claire Student  
Vice President of United Council of UW Students  
Board of Directors - United States Student Association

## Transfer Issues

Good morning, and thank you. My name is Ryan Adserias, and I am a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and I would like to begin by thanking the Task Force for the opportunity to take part in this critical conversation, and to my fellow students for asking me to in part, give voice to the 181,000 fellow students across 26 campuses statewide.

As a life-long Wisconsin resident, I grew up in the warm shadow of the University of Wisconsin. Although no one in my family graduated from any college, I knew the University of Wisconsin System plays an important role in the lives of the people of our great state, and is indeed a great source of pride for the citizens of Wisconsin. From the county-based UW Extension services; to the 13 UW Colleges, whose motto: "The Best Start for the Life You Want" served me well, to the incredible liberal arts educations provided by institutions such as UW-Eau Claire, River Falls, and La Crosse, to the groundbreaking, world class research carried out by the faculty and students at our Flagship in Madison, we have a lot to be proud of. Other states envy us, and indeed, they should. The commitment of our citizens and lawmakers over the past 164 years of Wisconsin state history has made our institutions strong, and at the forefront of American higher education.

But there is always room for change; to make things better, and to help make a great Wisconsin education more accessible to all who seek it.

As I said earlier, no one in my family went to a 2 or 4 year college. Indeed, no one really encouraged me to go to college. In fact, my high school guidance counselor asked me what my father did, and when I said "he's a plumber," he told me to apprentice under him. (Little did he know just how much technical education plumbers required, but that's a different story.) I knew however, my journey took me through one of the great state universities here in Wisconsin, and I was determined to go. I will admit, my high school grades were less than stellar however, I found the UW Fox Valley, one of the 13 two year campuses, willing to let me try my hand at accomplishing my goal of attending college.

I was successful. The faculty and staff at UW Fox Valley were so encouraging and helpful. Some of the faculty with whom I worked closely, encouraged me to apply to UW Madison, something I would have never dreamed possible. But through information provided by the carefully planned and integrated Transfer Information System, and the faculty and staff whose student-centered service mission is aimed at helping students achieve their goals, often through transfer, I was able to find my way, after a year at the Madison Area Technical College, to UW Madison. And the rest, they say, is history.

The UW System provides students from all across the state the opportunity and an accessible, affordable front door to our much-lauded system of colleges and universities. And indeed, the system is designed to allow students to transfer between and among the various institutions. This is a major benefit of the System, and one that all students should be made aware of. Unlike those of us who operate within the realm of higher education, most people have no idea what is out there. No one is born with this information floating around in their heads. We need to tell people about their opportunities in the UW System. The UW Colleges do a fantastic job of telling students about their transfer opportunities, and the Transfer Information System is a powerful tool. All too often however, students use the Transfer Information System too late in their careers to have it work most powerfully for them. In my view, students who may consider transferring to another institution should be identified early, and encouraged to use this web-based tool when making their semester course enrollment decisions. There may even be ways of linking the enrollment system with the Transfer Information System, allowing students to indicate a campus they foresee themselves transferring to, and the ability to see whether or not the courses they selected will transfer, and which requirements they would satisfy. These same students should be encouraged to run the "what if" degree audits. As a UW Fox Valley student, I know I invested more than a few hours dreaming up degree course plans, and figuring out what interesting courses I could take that fit that plan. More students should be encouraged to explore these options.

The WIN/WIN initiative is also an important and exciting plan for the student-citizens of Wisconsin. With increased pressure from the labor market on the part of citizens to achieve higher levels of education, and on state and local governments to ensure a highly skilled and educated workforce, identifying students close to an Associates Degree is a laudable effort. The UW System Growth Agenda calls for more graduates and is meeting its goals in this regard. President Obama has recently called for more Americans to earn at least 2 years of postsecondary education. And the labor market is calling for more graduates with a postsecondary degree. But for those students for whom other obligations and circumstances have made graduating with a degree difficult, conducting audits to identify those students who are close to an Associates degree is laudable, and should be expanded.

The articulation agreements between the Wisconsin Technical College System and the UW System is also an important path to the front door of the UW System's 13 universities. Students from WTCS schools make up about one quarter of the System's total transfer student population. This is a sizable number, and the WTCS and UW System should work to make the TIS more integrated into the WTCS system. As a transfer student from the Madison Area Technical College, I know their system is well-equipped and designed to transfer students to the UW System. But not all WTCS campuses have that as a primary mission. Making it easier for transfer students to access information and have a more integrated transfer system would make a UW System education even more accessible to a larger number of students statewide.



Finally, support for transfer advising, as laid out in the transfer recommendation document date February 27, 2012 is an important piece in the transfer puzzle. More often than not, it is first-generation students such as myself transferring from a two- to a four- year institution. This is a scary move. For many of us, we had no one to help guide us through the process. And while providing more web-based information is always helpful, providing more friendly faces willing and capable to helping students find their individualized path will always go a long way, especially for students transferring between two- and four-year institutions, but also for students transferring from four- to four-year universities.

Again, I would like to thank the Task Force for the opportunity to share my experience as a student.